



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/905,506	07/12/2001	Shell Sterling Simpson	10008181-1	3369
7590	09/10/2007		EXAMINER	
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration P.O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			SINGH, SATWANT K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2625	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/905,506	SIMPSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Satwant K. Singh	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 July 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-25 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-25 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 July 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

DOUGLAS Q. TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Tranaboult

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-89)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)

5) Information Disclosure Statement
Paper No(s)/Mail Date

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 16 July 2007 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 5, 9, 15, 19, and 22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claim 1, 3-5, and 7-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hicks et al. (US 7,086,001).

5. Regarding Claim 1, Moro et al disclose a method comprising: receiving a user selection of one or more non-printer-specific print options via a network

service (auto as the print destination) (col. 4, lines 15-42); storing the user selection of the one or more non-printer-specific print options in a user profile store (job tickets that have been saved for later use) (col. 7, lines 11-18); wherein the one or more non-printer-specific print options (auto as the print destination) (col. 4, lines 31-42) are identified for subsequent resolution, and wherein the one or more non-printer-specific print options can be applied to a plurality of other network services (desired output presentation) (col. 4, lines 24-29), the non-printer-specific print options serving to configure a printer in a particular manner for printing (job ticket contained within the job) (col. 4, lines 24-29), the particular manner defined by the one or more print non-printer-specific options submitted with a print request to the printer where the one or more non-printer-specific options are used in printing a document and the printer applies requested print options that the printer supports in accordance with the non-printer-specific print options that are identified in the print request (invention examines the job ticket information to route print jobs to the most effective printer) (col. 7, lines 19-28).

6. Regarding Claim 3, Hicks et al discloses a method, wherein the other network services comprise one or more other printing services communicatively coupled to the network service (Fig. 2, communications channel 23).

7. Regarding Claim 4, Hicks et al discloses a method, further comprising: receiving a user-selected name for the one or more non-printer-specific print options (Fig. 7, template); storing the one or more non-printer-specific print options as associated with the user-selected name (Fig. 7, template, save as); and allowing subsequent selection of the one or more non-printer-specific print

options by the user based on the user-selected name (Fig. 7, template, load) (job templates that have been saved for later use) (col. 7, lines 11-18).

8. Regarding Claim 5, Moro et al discloses one or more computer readable media encoded with a plurality of instructions that, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform acts including: communicating a plurality of possible print options to a client computer (job ticket) (col. 4, lines 22-30); receiving a user indication of selected ones of the plurality of possible print options (Fig. 2, user interface 12) (col. 7, lines 11-28); receiving an identifier, indicated by the user, associated with the selected print options (job ticket) (col. 7, lines 11-28); saving the selected print options with the associated identifier (job template are job tickets that have been saved for later use) (col. 7, lines 11-28); and making the selected print options subsequently available to the user for configuring of a plurality of printers in a particular manner (job ticket edited before submitting a job) (col. 7, lines 11-28), the particular manner defined by the one or more print options submitted with a print request to a respective one of the plurality of printers where the one or more options are used in printing a document (job ticket edited before submitting a job) (col. 7, lines 11-28), wherein each of the plurality of print options is not specific to a particular printer (user selects auto) and the respective one of the plurality of printers applies requested print options that the printer supports in accordance with the non-printer-specific print options that are identified in the print request (invention examines the job ticket information to route print jobs to the most effective printer) (col. 7, lines 19-28).

9. Regarding Claim 7, Hicks et al discloses one or more computer readable media, wherein the making further comprises making the selected print options subsequently available for user-selection by the identifier associated with the selected print options (Fig. 67, template) (col. 7, lines 11-18).

10. Regarding Claim 8, Hicks et al discloses one or more computer readable media, further comprising saving a plurality of sets of selected print options and associated identifiers, and making each of the plurality of sets of selected print options subsequently available to the user for configuring of a plurality of printers (job templates) (col. 7, lines 11-18).

11. Regarding Claim 9, Moro et al discloses a graphical user interface comprising: a plurality of portions illustrating user-selectable non-printer-specific print options and graphical mechanisms via which a user can select the print options (operator user interface) (col. 7, lines 11-28); an additional user-input mechanism via which the user can input an identifier of the selected non-printer-specific print options (edited job tickets) (col. 7, lines 11-28); and another graphical mechanism via which the user can indicate a desire to save the selected non-printer-specific print options as associated with the identifier (job templates that have been saved) (col. 7, lines 11-28) and for subsequent provision to a plurality of printers, the print options serving to configure a printer in a particular manner for printing (needs of a particular installation), the particular manner defined by the one or more non-printer-specific print options submitted with a print request to a respective one of the plurality of printers (user selects auto instead of a specific printer in the graphical user interface) (col. 7,

lines 19-28). where the one or more non-printer-specific print options are used in printing a document and the respective one of the plurality of printers applies requested print options that the printer supports in accordance with the non-printer-specific print options that are identified in the print request (invention examines the job ticket information to route print jobs to the most effective printer) (col. 7, lines 19-28).

12. Regarding Claim 10, Hicks et al discloses a graphical user interface, wherein one or more of the graphical mechanisms in the plurality of portions comprises a checkbox (Fig. 67).
13. Regarding Claim 11, Hicks et al discloses a graphical user interface, wherein one or more of the graphical mechanisms in the plurality of portions comprises a data input box via which the user can input alphanumeric characters (Fig. 67, save as).
14. Regarding Claim 12, Hicks et al discloses a graphical user interface, wherein the identifier of the selected non-printer-specific print options comprises a user-specified name (Fig. 67, save as).
15. Regarding Claim 13, Hicks et al discloses a graphical user interface, wherein the other graphical mechanism comprises a user-selectable on-screen button.
16. Regarding Claim 14, Hicks discloses a graphical user interface, wherein the graphical mechanisms in the plurality of portions include one or more of: a check box, a radio button, a list box, an editable text box, a command button, a drop-down list, a popup menu, a spinner, and a slider (Fig. 67).

17. Regarding Claim 15, Moro et al discloses one or more computer readable media encoded with a plurality of instructions that, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform acts including: receiving an indication (Fig. 2, user interface 12) (col. 7, lines 11-28) of one of a plurality of sets of non-printer- specific print options to be used in printing a document irrespective of a printer on which the document is to be printed (user selects auto as the print destination) (col. 7, lines 11-28), the non-printer-specific print options serving to configure the printer in a particular manner for printing, the particular manner defined by the one or more non-printer-specific print options submitted with a print request to a printer where the one or more non-printer-specific print options are used in printing the document (invention examines the job ticket information to route print jobs to the most effective printer) (col. 7, lines 19-28); receiving an indication of one of a plurality of printers on which the document is to be printed (each device is given a unique name) (col. 7, lines 40-60); and communicating the indicated set of non-printer-specific print options to the indicated printer irrespective of whether the printer supports one or more of the non-printer-specific print options identified in the set of non-printer- specific print options, wherein the printer applies requested print options that the printer supports in accordance with the non-printer-specific print options that are identified in the print request (automatic assignment) (col. 7, lines 40-60).

18. Regarding Claim 16, Hicks et al discloses a one or more computer readable media, wherein the plurality of instructions further cause the one or more processors to perform acts including: determining, based on the indication

of the one printer on which the document is to be printed, which of the non-printer-specific print options in the indicated set of non-printer-specific print options is supported by the one printer (types of tasks that can be processed); and communicating, for display to the user, an indication of which of the non-printer-specific print options in the indicated set of non-printer-specific print options is supported by the one printer (tasks that are assignable) (col. 7, lines 29-54).

19. Regarding Claim 17, Hicks et al discloses a one or more computer readable media, wherein the plurality of instructions further cause the one or more processors to perform acts including: determining, based on the indication of the one printer on which the document is to be printed, which of the non-printer-specific print options in the indicated set of non-printer-specific print options is supported by the one printer (types of tasks that can be processed); and communicating, for display to the user, an indication of which of the non-printer-specific print options in the indicated set of non-printer-specific print options is not supported by the one printer (tasks that are unassignable) (col. 7, lines 29-54).

20. Regarding Claim 18, Hicks et al discloses a one or more computer readable media, wherein the plurality of instructions further cause the one or more processors to perform acts including: determining, for each of the plurality of printers, which of the non- printer-specific print options in the indicated set of non-printer-specific print options is supported by the printer (types of tasks that can be processed); identifying one or more of the plurality of printers that support

the most non-printer-specific print options in the indicated set of non-printer-specific print options (device is a candidate); and communicating, for display to the user, the identified one or more printers (indicator that specifies if the device should be a candidate) (col. 7, lines 29-54).

21. Regarding Claim 19, Moro et al discloses a system comprising: a network interface configured to allow the system to communicate with one or more other systems via a network (Fig. 1, network document delivery system 10) (col. 4, lines 4-14); and a printer configuration user interface, communicatively coupled to the network interface (Fig. 2, user interface 12), wherein the printer configuration user interface is configured to allow a user of a client interface to select print options and group the selection together as a configuration associated with a particular name (job tickets that are saved for later use) (col. 7, lines 11-28), and wherein the printer configuration user interface is further configured to allow the user to select print options without regard for print options supported by a printer that the user can subsequently print to (user selects auto) (col. 7, lines 11-28), the print options serving to configure the printer in a particular manner for printing (job ticket allows separation of the job specific features) (col. 5, lines 54-64), the particular manner defined by the one or more print options submitted with a print request to the printer where the one or more options are used in printing the document (needs of a particular installation) (col. 7, lines 11-28), wherein each of the plurality of print options is not specific to a particular printer and the printer applies requested print options that the printer supports in accordance with the non-printer-specific print options that are

identified in the print request (invention examines the job ticket information to route print jobs to the most effective printer) (col. 7, lines 19-28).

22. Regarding Claim 20, Hicks et al discloses a system, further comprising: a print user interface, communicatively coupled to the network interface, wherein the printer user interface is configured to allow the user to select one of the configurations by its associated name (Fig. 67, template, load), and further configured to allow the user to select a printer that is to be used to print a document using the configuration (Fig. 74).

23. Regarding Claim 21, Hicks et discloses a system, wherein the print user interface is further configured to allow the user to select one of the configurations without regard for print options supported by the printer that is to be used to print the document (auto selected instead of a specific printer) (col. 7, lines 11-18).

24. Regarding Claim 22, Moro et al discloses a method, implemented in a print service coupled to a network, the method comprising: receiving, from a device in the network, a print request identifying both a document to be printed and a set of desired non-printer-specific print options (job is sent from a data source) (col. 4, lines 21-29), wherein the set of desired non-printer-specific print options includes a corresponding setting for one or more of the desired non-printer-specific print options (use selects auto as the print destination) (col. 4, lines 30-42); checking whether a printer corresponding to the print service supports the desired non-printer-specific print options (devices have a subset of attributes that define the types of tasks that can be processed) (col. 7, lines 29-39); and for each option in the set of desired non-printer-specific print options,

applying the setting corresponding to the option if the printer supports the non-printer-specific print option (task can be processed) (col. 7, lines 29-39), and ignoring the setting corresponding to the option if the printer does not support the non-printer-specific print option (unassignable task) (col. 7, lines 29-39).

25. Regarding Claim 23, Hicks et al discloses a method, wherein the print service comprises a print server corresponding to the printer (Fig. 1, server 13) (col. 4, lines 4-14).

26. Regarding Claim 24, Hicks et al discloses a method, wherein the print service is implemented at the printer (Fig. 1, document output devices 16) (col. 4, lines 4-14).

27. Regarding Claim 25, Hicks et al discloses a method, wherein the applying comprises applying the setting corresponding to the non-printer-specific print option if the printer supports the non-printer-specific print option without regard for whether the printer is currently capable of carrying out the non-printer-specific print option (use selects auto as the print destination) (col. 4, lines 30-42).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

28. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

29. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hicks et al in view of Yanagidaira (US 6,490,052).

30. Regarding Claim 2, Hicks et al fail to teach a method, wherein the network service comprises an Internet home page.

Yanagidaira teaches teach a method, wherein the network service comprises an Internet home page.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Hicks with the teaching of Yanagidaira to put the shared printer information on the home page so the user can set the print options for the printing device via a web browser.

Conclusion

31. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Moro et al. (US 6,327,051) discloses a user entering control information for controlling a printing device, the information stored in a user information storage unit.

McGinnis et al. (US 6,384,933) discloses a printing system utilizing object-oriented modules in a distributed object system.

Moro et al. (US 6,704,122) discloses a user entering control information for controlling a printing device, the information stored in a user information storage unit.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Satwant K. Singh whose telephone number is

(571) 272-7468. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Satwant Singh

sks

Satwant K. Singh
Examiner
Art Unit 2625

Douglas Q. Tran

DOUGLAS Q. TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER